Dear Senators,

Thankyou for the opportunity to put a brief submission in on this ill-conceived, hastily introduced Bill and rushed enquiry. One can not help observing the foregoing facts and commenting on them as follows.

<u>Ill-conceived</u> -- when one considers the folly that has occurred in places like Great Britain under similar legislation which folly has been widely reported. The incidents that have been reported are laughable but the outcome has been far from laughable for ordinary citizens going about their daily lives. People used to say that Queensland used to be a Police State. This legislation if passed will make those days seem serene. Be prepared also for further increases in Bureaucracies and Police numbers to cope. Lawyers (in addition to chasing ambulances) will now be hanging on the words that come out of the mouths of all and sundry. HERE IS A GOOD TEST OF THE SANITY OF THIS PROPOSED LAW. I CHALLENGE YOU TO MAKE IT APPLICABLE WITHIN PARLIAMENT AS IT SITS AND TO ALLOW 'Human Rights and Anti-discrimination Lawyers' TO SIT IN THE GALLERY AND TAKE NOTES ON EVERY WORD YOU SAY. Think carefully about that! This proposed law is folly.

<u>Hastily Introduced</u> -- The speed with which this proposed law has been introduced indicates that those who saw their proposed "Bill of Rights" founder under Prime Minister Rudd and Attorney General Mc Clelland have learnt a lesson -- ' Do not give opportunity ( enough time for ) a thorough debate in the public and the press. That really killed our Bill of Rights'

"But" you say, "This is not a Bill of Rights – this is different!" It is, but the humanist and atheist and anti-Christian elements, having failed once, have used it as a vehicle to forward their sectarian concepts which fly in the face of a Christian heritage coming down to us from Common Law which in turn flowed out of the Moral Law of God summarised in the 10 Commandments.

<u>Rushed Enquiry</u> --- This appears to be part of the 'tickyness' of politics. Have an enquiry so you can trumpet that 'the people were consulted'; but make it short, and if you can, have the enquiry when most of the populace is otherwise preoccupied like just before Christmas. Also with an election looming, whether it passes or not, you have your credentials to present to the

above described anti-Christian elements.

Frankly this whole proceeding is shameful. Politicians are despised enough without this sort of gerrymandering of the political process.

THIS CITIZEN BELIEVES THE BILL SHOULD BE THROWN OUT.

However if you very unwisely want it to go forward in some truncated form then :-

Remove the new grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, and religion, political opinion, and marital and relationship status.

Strictly limit its area of application, define those areas -- definitely not all public life.

Remove Section 19(2)(b) . remove the broad vagueness. It just leaves the law open to abuse.

Narrow down and clearly define terms otherwise the lawyers will have a field day. How do you 'prove' conduct is "in good faith, for the purpose of achieving a particular aim" and prove "that aim is a legitimate aim". This is the stuff of childish idealism or childish ideology.

Section 33 should not proceed. In voluntary religious bodies all conduct in the context of the bill should be excepted not just some, AND a religious body should be innocent until proven guilty by the complainant, not vice versa. There are plenty of avenues in existing law for people who are aggrieved in some way by a voluntary religious organisation.

Remove Section 33(3)

Remove Section 124

Remove Section 51(Page 63)

Peter Torlach